BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images, please do not report the images to the Image Problem Mailbox.

PRA

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,204	11/28/2001	Jen-Fu Lee	56712 (71987)	1262

21874 7590 05/26/2004

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. BOX 55874
BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER	
WILSON, YOLANDA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2113	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/996,204	LEE, JEN-FU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yolanda Wilson	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 November 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,3,4,6,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (USPN 5708775A) in view of Goddard et al. (USPN US006622266B1) in further view of Sigl (US Publication Number 20030061007A1). As per claim 1, Nakamura discloses continually detecting whether any one of the server platforms has an abnormal operating condition; if yes, generating a text-based system-fault indicating file in column 4, lines 2-16.

Nakamura fails to explicitly state transferring the warning message retrieved from the warning-message database via the network system to the workstations.

Goddard et al. discloses this limitation in column 4, lines 55-63.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer the warning message retrieved from the warning-message database via the network system to the workstations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to transfer the warning message retrieved from the warning-message database via the network system to the workstations because notification of the error disclosed in the warning message can lead to the error being resolved. Goddard et al. discloses this in column 3, lines 52-57.

Nakamura and Goddard et al. fail to explicitly state transferring the text-based system-fault indicating file to a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward text-based system-fault indicating files; from the warning-message database, retrieving a warning message corresponding to the system-fault indicating file.

Sigl discloses these limitations on page 2, paragraph 0021, "The machine 12 outputs a machine signal to the error controller 10 as coming from that particular machine 12. Further, the machine signal includes an error condition that when compared against the database, returns a corresponding error message extracted from the database that is presented to the technician or operator..."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transfer the text-based system-fault indicating file to a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward text-based system-fault indicating files; from the warning-message database, retrieving a warning message corresponding to the system-fault indicating file. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to transfer the text-based system-fault indicating file to a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward text-based system-fault indicating files; from the warning-message database, retrieving a warning message corresponding to the system-fault indicating file because the database helps to determine through correlation what type of error has occurred on a component and helps to determine a possible solution to the error. Sigl discloses this on page 2, paragraphs 0017.

3. As per claim 3, Nakamura fails to explicitly state the warning message is transferred in e-mail via the network system to the workstations.

Goddard discloses this limitation in column 4, lines 55-63.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the warning message being transferred in e-mail via the network system to the workstations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the warning message being transferred in e-mail via the network system to the workstations because e-mail is an effective way of notifying more than one person to any problem a component being monitored is having.

4. As per claim 4, Nakamura discloses a plurality of fault detection modules, each of which is integrated in one of the server platforms for detecting whether the associated one of the server platforms has an abnormal operating condition, and if yes, capable of generating a text-based system-fault indicating file in column 4, lines 2-16.

Nakamura and Goddard et al. fail to explicitly state a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward system-fault indicating files, and which is linked to all the fault detection modules to receive the system-fault indicating file and capable of retrieving the corresponding warning message mapped to the received system-fault indicating file.

Sigl discloses these limitations on page 2, paragraph 0021, "The machine 12 outputs a machine signal to the error controller 10 as coming from that particular machine 12. Further, the machine signal includes an error condition that when

compared against the database, returns a corresponding error message extracted from the database that is presented to the technician or operator..."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward system-fault indicating files, and which is linked to all the fault detection modules to receive the system-fault indicating file and capable of retrieving the corresponding warning message mapped to the received system-fault indicating file. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward system-fault indicating files, and which is linked to all the fault detection modules to receive the system-fault indicating file and capable of retrieving the corresponding warning message mapped to the received system-fault indicating file because the database helps to determine through correlation what type of error has occurred on a component and helps to determine a possible solution to the error. Sigl discloses this on page 2, paragraphs 0017.

Nakamura fails to explicitly state a warning-message sender, which is internally linked to the warning-message database and externally linked to the network system, for transferring the warning message via the network system to the workstations.

Goddard discloses this limitation in column 4, lines 55-63.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a warning-message sender, which is internally linked to the warning-message database and externally linked to the network system,

for transferring the warning message via the network system to the workstations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a warning-message sender, which is internally linked to the warning-message database and externally linked to the network system, for transferring the warning message via the network system to the workstations because e-mail is an effective way of notifying more than one person to any problem a component being monitored is having.

5. As per claim 6, Nakamura fails to explicitly state the warning-message sender is an e-mail server, which is capable of transferring the warning message in e-mail via the network system to the workstations.

Goddard discloses this limitation in column 4, lines 55-63.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the warning-message sender is an e-mail server, which is capable of transferring the warning message in e-mail via the network system to the workstations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the warning-message sender is an e-mail server, which is capable of transferring the warning message in e-mail via the network system to the workstations because e-mail is an effective way of notifying more than one person to any problem a component being monitored is having.

6. As per claim 7, Nakamura discloses a plurality of fault detection modules, each of which is integrated in one of the server platforms for detecting whether the associated one of the server platforms has an abnormal operating condition, and if yes, capable of generating a text-based system-fault indicating file in column 4, lines 2-16.

Nakamura and Goddard et al. fail to explicitly state a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward system-fault indicating files, and which is linked to all the fault detection modules to receive the system-fault indicating file and capable of retrieving the corresponding warning message mapped to the received system-fault indicating file.

Sigl discloses these limitations on page 2, paragraph 0021, "The machine 12 outputs a machine signal to the error controller 10 as coming from that particular machine 12. Further, the machine signal includes an error condition that when compared against the database, returns a corresponding error message extracted from the database that is presented to the technician or operator..."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward system-fault indicating files, and which is linked to all the fault detection modules to receive the system-fault indicating file and capable of retrieving the corresponding warning message mapped to the received system-fault indicating file. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have a warning-message database, which stores a mapping table of warning messages toward system-fault indicating files, and which is linked to all the fault detection modules to receive the system-fault indicating file and capable of retrieving the corresponding warning message mapped to the received system-fault indicating file because the database helps to determine through correlation what type of

error has occurred on a component and helps to determine a possible solution to the error. Sigl discloses this on page 2, paragraphs 0017.

Nakamura fails to explicitly state an e-mail server, which is internally linked to the warning-message database and externally linked to the network system, for transferring the warning message in e-mail via the network system to the workstations.

Goddard discloses this limitation in column 4, lines 55-63.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an e-mail server, which is internally linked to the warning-message database and externally linked to the network system, for transferring the warning message in e-mail via the network system to the workstations. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have an e-mail server, which is internally linked to the warning-message database and externally linked to the network system, for transferring the warning message in e-mail via the netwcrk system to the workstations because e-mail is an effective way of notifying more than one person to any problem a component being monitored is having.

103 Rejection of claims 2,5,8

7. Claims 2,5,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura (USPN 5708775A) in view of Goddard et al. (USPN US006622266B1) in view of Sigl (US Publication Number 20030061007A1) in further view of Levi (USPN 6658586B1). As per claims 2,5,8, Nakamura, Goddard, Sigl fail to explicitly state the

text-based system-fault indicating file is transferred via FTP to the warning-message database.

Levi discloses this limitation in column 9, lines 6-9.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the text-based system-fault indicating file is transferred via FTP to the warning-message database. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the text-based system-fault indicating file is transferred via FTP to the warning-message database because FTP is a type of protocol used to transfer information from one device to another.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100